

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/771,444	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FUJISATO, RYOSAKU	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ginger T. Chapman	<b>Art Unit</b> 3761	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Ginger T. Chapman.

(2) Michael C. Jones.

**Date of Interview:** 20 May 2009

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

  

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
 35 USC 103(a):claims 1-2, 4; 35 USC 112: claims 15, 16

Claims discussed:  
 1, 2, 4, 15, 16

Prior art documents discussed:  
 Kostrov US 6706006, Martin US 6962298, Henkin US 5230106.

  

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*During a telephone call with Applicants' representative, the newly amended limitations & language clarifying the features of the air self-suction port formed on rear wall opposite the air/liquid jetting port; the tank & tank air-introducing port and the rotating member was discussed. In particular, the instant combination of jetting port having guide portions which comprise the structure of the flow out portions composed of embodiments of either notches or ports distinguishes over Kostrov's jetting port structure which lacks the guide and flow-out structures. Also with respect to distinguishing over the prior art rotating members which adjust waterpressure during use by valving water lumens while the instant rotating member adjust water pressure by valving the atmospheric air flow suctioned into the device.*

*The interview was most helpful with respect to clarifying how the combination of the different elements as now specifically recited in the independent claims, result in different structures and modes of operation of the device as distinguished over the prior art.*

  

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  

/G. T. C./  
 Examiner, Art Unit 3761

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

